```
1
                                     BEFORE THE
                             SHORELINES HEARINGS BOARD
 2
                                STATE OF WASHINGTON
 3
     IN THE MATTER OF
     A SUBSTANTIAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT
 4
     DENIED BY KITSAP COUNTY TO
     STATE OF WASHINGTON,
5
     DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES,
6
     STATE OF WASHINGTON,
     DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES;
7
     DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES;
     DOUG LYLE; AND GILBERT FRANCKLYN,
 ₹
                                                   SHB No. 78-37
                   Appellants,
9
                                                   FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
           ν.
10
                                                   CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
                                                   AND ORDER
     KITSAP COUNTY,
11
                   Respondent.
12
     STATE OF WASHINGTON,
13
     DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY,
     Amıcus Curiae
14
```

This matter, the review of Kitsap County's denial of a shoreline

substantial development conditional use permit to State of Washington,

Department of Natural Resources, was brought before the Shorelines

Hearings Board, Nat W. Washington, Chairman, Chris Smith, Rodney

15

16

17

18

Kerslake and James E. Connolly on April 7, 8, 9, and 10, 1980, in Lacey, Washington. Hearing Examiner William A. Harrison presided.

Appellant, Department of Natural Resources, appeared by David A.

Batemen, Assistant Attorney General; appellant, Department of

Fisheries, appeared by Dennis D. Reynolds, Assistant Attorney General;

appellants Doug Lyle and Gilbert Francklyn also appeared. Respondent,

Kitsap County, appeared by Patricia K. Schafer, Deputy Prosecuting

Attorney; Department of Ecology, Amicus Curiae, appeared by Robert V.

Jensen, Assistant Attorney General.

Having read and heard the testimony, having examined the exhibits, having viewed the site of the proposed development, having read the Hearing Memoranda, having the heard the arguments of counsel and being fully advised, the Shorelines Hearings Board makes the following

FINDINGS OF FACT

Ι

This matter arises in Agate Pass in Kitsap County. The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) manages 4 tracts of subtidal public lands at that location. In 1972, 3 of the 4 tracts were leased to Gilbert Francklyn for the purpose of harvesting clams. For the ensuing six years, until 1978, Francklyn directed the harvest of clams through use of a mechanical clam harvester. This activity is regulated by a permit process administered by the Department of Fisheries (DOF).

On May 17, 1978, DNR filed an application for a shoreline management substantial development permit with Kitsap County under the Shoreline Management Act, chapter 90.58 RCW. The proposed development consisted of "continual harvesting of subtidal hardshell clams with

Ţ

.4

า6

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

diesel powered vessel having the appearance of a small commercial fishing boat. To this is attached the top of a conveyor belt system which extends below water to the substrate. Hydraulic pressure is used to loosen the substrate and dislodge clams found there, which are then carried by the conveyor belt to the vessel above.

ΙI

the use of mechanical harvester."1 The mechanical harvester used

prior to the DNR application, and proposed under it, consists of a

The Kitsap County Board of County Commissioners denied the DNR application on September 7, 1978, under authority of the Kitsap County Shoreline Master Program adopted in July, 1977. Upon request for review this Board reversed on grounds that said master program had not been approved and adopted by the Department of Ecology so as to be effective at the time of DNR's application. The matter was remanded to Kitsap County for application of the Kitsap County Shoreline Master Program adopted July 1, 1976, while this Board retained jurisdiction.

The Kitsap County Board of County Commissioners subsequently applied the Master Program of July 1, 1976, and denied the DNR application again on October 15, 1979. From this appellants request

^{1.} The application also referenced the final environmental impact statement which describes the proposal as "harvesting of subtidal hardshell clams with a hydraulic escalator shellfish harvestor."

| 1 | re |
|----|-----|
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | 11 |
| 5 | ab |
| 6 | cc |
| 7 | |
| 8 | bı |
| 9 | pc |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | Ac |
| 15 | st |
| 16 | Cl |
| 17 | C |
| 18 | |
| 19 | sį |
| 20 | Уe |
| 21 | 1 r |
| 22 | |
| 23 | l |
| | l |

25

26

27

ceview.

III

Agate Pass is an important clam site in that there are only .

limited subtidal areas in Puget Sound where clams set and grow abundantly. Agate Pass is one of these because of its optimum combination of swift water currents and coarse substrate.

Harvesting on the 3 tracts between 1973 and 1978 has yielded butter, littleneck and horse clams totaling the following weights, in pounds:

1973 - 464,988 1974 - 240,316 1975 - 305,258 1976 - 330,492 1977 - 270,575 1978 - 240,970

Adequate spawning stock exists off of the tracts to restore clam stocks on the tracts by the natural movement of seed carried by the currents. Because of this a maximum sustained yield, 3 species combined, for the 3 tracts, may be estimated as 274,000 annually.

The 3 tracts now have two or more times the clam density, 3 species combined, considered commercially harvestable despite the six years of mechancial harvesting. While natural restoration may result in different proportions of butter, littleneck and horse clams than

existed previously, all of these species are of substantial commercial value.

It is not probable that the proposed mechanical clam harvesting will deplete or over-harvest the clam resource at the site in question.

IV

The currents of Agate Pass will disperse siltation from mechanical harvesting quite rapidly. Likewise, the coarse substrate of the tracts provides minimal fine material of the type which causes siltation. Siltation from mechanical clam harvesting in this area will not significantly inquire underwater plant life.

Eelgrass exists primarily at the shallow border of the 3 tracts, and kelp is located on the rocky areas least suitable to mechanical clam harvesting. Harvesting on the 3 tracts has reduced eelgrass and macroalgae population although this effect has been mitigated to a large degree by natural regeneration.

Because of substrate conditions over most subtidal area, neither eelgrass nor kelp would grow abundantly in Agate Pass, relative to other waters, even assuming no mechanical clam harvesting. Puget Sound, generally, is sufficiently nutrient rich so that any net reduction in kelp or other macroalgae which harvesting is likely to cause will have no significant effect on marine food chains.

v

Areas within the tracts have been identified by Department of Fisheries (DOF) as potential ling cod spawning areas. Because of this, DOF will not allow mechanical clam harvesting there until it carries out further studies to determine if, in fact, any damage to

ling cod could occur. These areas are approximated by the cross-hatching on exhibit R-20.

The results of the studies just described should be presented to both Kitsap County and the Department of Ecology.

VI

Subtidal mechanical clam harvesting in Puget Sound, and even Agate Pass, is in an incipient stage. All parties concerned will benefit from careful review of its effects. The present application of DNR should therefore be permitted under a permit for a fixed term to allow re-evaluation based upon facts which will arise in the future.

A baseline study should also be conducted on the unharvested northeast tract (no. 10501) to inventory species and quantity of clams and other major marine plant and animal species. This must occur prior to harvesting of the northeast tract so as to provide a basis for before and after comparison. This study should be conducted by the Department of Fisheries and the results presented to Kitsap County and the Department of Ecology.

VII

The normal background noise level in Agate Pass varies from 42-50 dBA. With the operation of the mechanical clam harvester in the past, this level has reached 60 dBA. The harvester has operated throughout the day and night in the past. This noise has unreasonably interfered with enjoyment of life and property by persons residing on the shores of Agate Pass. Noise from the harvester primarily emanates from its two diesel engines. Although action has been taken to reduce this noise, further reduction is practical. Limitations on both peak and

٩<u>6</u>

duration of noise are necessary to prevent unreasonable interference.

The mechanical clam harvester should result in peak noise level, in the receiving area on the shores of Agate Pass, of no more than 55 dBA. The mechanical clam harvester should not operate except between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. These hours of operation were stipulated by appellants on the record at hearing.

VII

It is not probable that the proposed mechanical clam harvesting will result in trespass. The authority to control such a problem resides in the police power of the county as well as with the licensing power of the Department of Fisheries.

IX

Any Conclusion of Law which should be deemed a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such.

From these Findings the Board enters the following

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Ι

The DNR application is for a shoreline substantial development and conditional use permit. As such it must be consistent with (1)—the provisions of the Shoreline Management Act, chapter 90.58 RCW and (2)—the Kitsap County Shoreline Master Program of 1976. RCW—90.58.140(2)(b). See also this Board's Order on Pre-Hearing Motions entered May 29, 1979, and Agreed Order of Remand entered June 20, 1979, herein.

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

The site in question is a shoreline of state-wide significance. RCW 90.58.030(2)(e)(iii). The proposed mechanical clam harvesting constitutes an activity of state-wide interest, can result in long term over short term benefit and can protect the resources and ecology of the shoreline, as prescribed for shorelines of statewide significance by RCW 90.58.020. Likewise, subtidal mechanical clam harvesting, as proposed, is unique to use of the water area, and as such is a preferred use. RCW 90.58.020.

III

The Kitsap County Shoreline Master Program of 1976 (KCSMP) defines aquaculture as the "culture or farming of . . . shell fish . . . " Part 7, II, p. 18. It is the policy of Kitsap County that:

"Aquaculture should be encouraged in Kitsap County and so located to be compatible with navigation and upland use."
KCSMP, id, supra.

Acquaculture is permitted as a conditional use in the semi-rural environment, KCSMP, id, supra, which includes the site in question, PCSMP, Part 4, p. 9.

The KCSMP criteria for permitting a conditional use is at Part 8, II, p. 53::

Conditional use permits shall be granted only after the applicant can demonstrate all of the following:

1. The use will cause no unreasonably adverse effects on the environment or other existing or potential uses which are allowed outright in the subject environment;

| 2 |
|-----------|
| 3 |
| 4 |
| 5 |
| 6 |
| 7 |
| 8 |
| 9 |
| 10 |
| 11 |
| 12 |
| 13 |
| 14 |
| 15 |
| 16 |
| 17 |
| 18 |
| 19 |
| 20 |
| 21 |
| 22 |
| 23 |
| 24 |
| 25. |
| า6 |
| 27 |

- 2. The use will not interfere with public use of public shorelines;
- Design of the site will be compatible with the surroundings and Master Program;
- 4. The proposed use will not be contrary to the general intent of the Master Program.

IV

The proposed development meets the requirements of both the Shoreline Management Act and Kitsap County Shoreline Master Program provided that the following conditions are imposed: 2

- 1. That the shoreline substantial development and conditional use permit prescribed herein shall expire five years after final approval by Department of Ecology.
- 2. That noise from the mechanical clam harvester shall not intrude into the on-shore property of others at levels above 55 dBA; provided, however, that this level may be exceeded as provided for day time operation under WAC 173-60-040(2)(c) and Kitsap County Ordinance 10.28.040(c). The mechanical clam harvester shall not operate except between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., 3 Monday

^{2.} The conditions which follow also render the proposed development consistent with Department of Ecology conditional use criteria, WAC 173-14-140, were that criteria applied.

^{3.} This condition is consistent with the interpretation given by Kitsap County to its noise ordinance, 10.28 and also consistent with the position of Department of Ecology, amicus curiae in this matter, concerning its noise regulation, chapter 173-60 WAC. In this case we must apply the Kitsap County Shoreline Master Program provisions quoted in Conclusion of Law III, above. In doing so we independently reach the noise limitations set forth above by application of the Kitsap County Shoreline Master Program to the facts of this case. See WAC 173-60-060 allowing regulation of noise as a nuisance notwithstanding the specific requirements of chapter 173-60 WAC. We construe the regulatory wording of the Kitsap County Shoreline Master Program to fall within WAC 173-60-060 in this matter.

through Friday.

- That prior to mechanical clam harvesting on the northeast tract (no. 10501) a baseline study shall be conducted by the Department of Fisheries to inventory species and quantity of clams and other major marine plant and animal species and to gather any further information about the tract which is deemed proper by Department of Fisheries. The results of this baseline study shall be presented to Kitsap County and Department of Ecology.
- The results of Department of Fisheries studies in the areas identified as potential ling cod spawning areas (Exhibit R-20, SHB 78-37) shall be presented to Kitsap County and Department of Ecology.

Any Finding of Fact which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law is hereby adopted as such.

From these Conclusions the Board enters the following

ORDER

The action of Kitsap County is reversed and this matter is remanded to Kitsap County for issuance of a shoreline substantial development and conditional use permit containing the conditions listed in Conclusion of Law IV, above.

20

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

| 1 | DONE at Lacey, Washington this day of April, 1980. | |
|----|--|---|
| 2 | SHORELINES HEARINGS BOARD | |
| 3 | May W. WASHINGTON, Chairman | , |
| 4 | Wall W. Washington, Charlingin | |
| 5 | Largo Some of | |
| 6 | CHRIS SMITH, Member | |
| 7 | 7 1 my/01 | |
| 8 | RODNEY KERSLAKE, Member | |
| 9 | $O \sim 10^{-10}$ | 1 |
| 10 | JAMES E. CONNOLLY, Member | 1 |
| | , | |
| 11 | · · | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| -4 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| | | |

6

CERTIFICATION OF MAILING

1 |

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

| I, Trish Ryan, certify that I mailed, postage prepaid, copies |
|---|
| of the foregoing document on the lot day of April, 1980, to |
| each of the following-named parties at the last known post office |
| addresses, with the proper postage affixed to the respective |
| envelopes: |
| David A. Bateman |

David A. Bateman Assistant Attorney General Department of Natural Resources 310 Public Lands Building Olympia, WA 98504

Dennis D. Reynolds Assistant Attorney General Departments of Fisheries & Game 600 North Capitol Way Olympia, WA 98504

Patricia K. Schafer
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Kitsap County Courthouse
614 Division Street
Port Orchard, WA 98366

Robert V. Jensen Assistant Attorney General Department of Ecology St. Martin's College Olympia, WA 98504

Lloyd Taylor Department of Ecology St. Martin's College Olympia, WA 98504

Kitsap County Commissioners Kitsap County Courthouse Port Orchard, WA 98370

Gilbert Francklyn Route 4, Box 624 Poulsbo, WA 98370

Doug Lyle Route 1 Chinacum, WA 98325

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER 12